

USDC STUDY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DATE FILED: 1/25/10

Cooper v. A. Sargenti, Inc., 877 F.2d 170, 172 (2d Cir. 1989). As a threshold matter, a plaintiff must demonstrate that her claim has substance or a likelihood of success. See Hodge v. Police Officers, 802 F.2d 58, 60 (2d Cir. 1986). In addition, in reviewing a request for counsel, the Court must be cognizant of the fact that volunteer attorney time is a precious commodity, and thus should not grant appointment of counsel indiscriminately. Cooper, 877 F.2d at 172.

A more fully developed record will be necessary before this Court can determine if Plaintiff's chances of success warrant the appointment of counsel. Therefore, Plaintiff's application is denied without prejudice to its renewal at such time as the existence of potentially meritorious claims may be demonstrated.

Additionally, Plaintiff's motion to "reverse and deny" the extension of time for Defendant to respond granted on January 8, 2010 (Docket No. 5), is denied.

This Court reminds Plaintiff that the pro se office is a valuable resource in assisting litigants, such as plaintiff, who proceed in federal court without the assistance of counsel. Plaintiff is strongly encouraged to contact the pro se office for information:

Pro Se Clerk's Office  
Southern District of New York  
500 Pearl Street  
New York, New York 10007  
(212) 805-0175

Dated: January 25, 2010  
New York, New York

SO ORDERED:

  
WILLIAM H. PAULEY III  
U.S.D.J.

*Copy mailed to:*

Victor L. Suarez  
P.O. Box 938  
New York, NY 10025-0938  
*Plaintiff Pro Se*

Abra Mason  
Assistant Corporation Counsel  
New York City Law Department  
100 Church Street  
New York, NY 10007-2601  
*Counsel for Defendants*